

S/N 10/678,361

Response to Office Action mailed December 13, 2004

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1 and 16 are hereby amended. Claim 42 is new.

The amendment of claim 1, reciting a "duplexer comprising a laminate in which at least four dielectric layers and at least two electrode layers are laminated alternately", is supported by page 18, lines 10-26. The amendment of claim 1, reciting that coupling line of the duplexer, and the first and second stripline resonators are formed in a planar shape on one plane, is supported, for example by Figure 9. The amendment of claim 1, reciting the width of the coupling line being uniform from one end to the other end, is supported, for example, by Figure 5. The amendment of claim 1, reciting the external terminal connected to the coupling line is on a short-circuited side of the first filter and the second filter, is supported, for example, by Figure 5, page 20, lines 11-14, and page 18, lines 26-32. Claim 16 is amended to conform to the language of claim 1. New claim 42 is supported, for example, by Figure 5.

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Nishijima (US 6,304,158). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 1 requires that "the external terminal connected to the coupling line is on a short-circuited side of the first filter and the second filter". In contrast, the external terminal taught by Nishijima is on an open end side (see Figures 8B and 8D and column 6, lines 45-46). Favorable reconsideration of claim 1 is requested.

Claim 2 was rejected as being unpatentable over Nishijima in view of Hirai (US 5,497,130). Applicants traverse this rejection. Hirai does not remedy the deficiencies of Nishijima previously noted. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of Hirai as applied to claim 2. Favorable reconsideration of claim 2 is requested.

Claim 16 was rejected as being unpatentable over Nishijima in view of Tada (US 5,986,521). Applicants traverse this rejection. Tada does not remedy the deficiencies of Nishijima previously noted. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of Tada as applied to claim 16. Favorable reconsideration of claim 16 is requested.

S/N 10/678,361

Response to Office Action mailed December 13, 2004

Claim 18 was rejected as being unpatentable over Nishijima, in view of Tada, and further in view of Hirai. Applicants traverse this rejection. Tada and Hirai do not remedy the deficiencies of Nishijima previously noted. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of Tada and Hirai as applied to claim 18. Favorable reconsideration of claim 18 is requested.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected as being unpatentable over Tsukamoto (US 6,525,625) in view of Nishijima. Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 1 requires that the duplexer includes a laminate in which at least four dielectric layers and at least two electrode layers are laminated alternately. The combination of Tsukamoto and Nishijima does not teach the claimed multi-layered laminate. Favorable reconsideration of claims 1 and 2 is requested.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612)371-5237.

Respectfully submitted,



MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Dated: April 8, 2005

By

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300

DPM:mfe